

REMARKS

The amendment of claim 1 is being filed in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of March 18, 2008. Claim 1 is amended as shown. No new matter has been added. With this amendment, claims 1 to 17 remain pending.

I. Disclosure of amended claim 1

As proposed by the examiner, amended claim 1 has been amended by the feature “*wherein the third carrier film is conveyed by a sheet conveying mechanism and  $\alpha$  is a positive value defined as the maximum width within which one side of a sheet may meander when the sheet is conveyed by the sheet conveying mechanism and is a value inherent to the sheet conveying mechanism*”. The examiner is thanked for this proposed language.

This amendment is disclosed in paragraph [0050] of the present application as published.

II. 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection

Claims 1 to 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite, in sections (1) and (2) of the Office Action.

As claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the examiner, the rejections set forth in sections (1) and (2) of the Office Action are rendered moot.

The claims of the present application particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention and thus fulfill the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112.

III. Double patenting

Claims 1 to 17 were provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting, in view of Application No. 10/553536.

A. It is noted that Application No. 10/553536 to which the examiner refers as the “copending application” has been allowed in the meantime.

B. Amended claim 1 of the present application differs from claim 1 of Application No. 10/553536 at least in the following features:

- a first carrier film including a surface-treated region on which a surface treatment is performed for improving releasability and non-surface-treated regions on which no surface treatment is performed on both sides of the surface-treated region,
- bringing the surface of the adhesive layer formed on the third carrier film and the surface of the ceramic green sheet into close contact with each other and pressing them, thereby bonding the adhesive layer onto the surface of the ceramic green sheet,
- peeling off the second carrier film from the inner electrode layer, and
- wherein the third carrier film is conveyed by a sheet conveying mechanism and  $\alpha$  is a positive value defined as the maximum width within which one side of a sheet may meander when the sheet is conveyed by the sheet conveying mechanism and is a value inherent to the sheet conveying mechanism.

C. Accordingly, the configuration of the multi-layered unit of claim 1 of the present application substantially differs from that of claim 1 of Application No. 10/553536:

The order of layers according to claim 1 of the present application is the following: a first carrier film including surface-treated regions and non-surface-treated regions, a ceramic green sheet on the surface of the first carrier film and an inner electrode layer. That is, the surface-treated

regions and non-surface-treated regions are adjacent to the ceramic green sheet of the multi-layered unit (cf. figure 8 of the present application).

The order of layers according to claim 1 of Application No. 10/553536 is the following: a ceramic green sheet on the surface of a first carrier film, an inner electrode layer, and the surface-treated regions and non-surface-treated regions. That is, the surface-treated regions and non-surface-treated regions are proximate to the inner electrode layer of the multi-layered unit (cf. figure 8 of Application No. 10/553536).

D. There is no hint in Application No. 10/553536 which would motivate the skilled person to look for an alternative solution.

Also, there is no teaching in Application No. 10/553536 that a rearrangement of the surface-treated and non-surface-treated regions could achieve an advantageous effect similar to that of the subject matter of claim 1 of Application No. 10/553536.

There is no hint in the Application No. 10/553536 which would lead the skilled person to rearrange the order of layers according to claim 1 of the present application.

Therefore, the subject matters of claims 1 to 17 of the present application are not obvious in view of Application No. 10/553536. Thus, the rejection as to double-patenting is not justified, and it is kindly requested that the double-patenting rejection be withdrawn.

#### IV. Concluding comments

Claim 1 is further amended to clarify that its recitations do not fall within the scope of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.

Other amendments are made to claim 1 as shown so as to place the claim in a better form.

Application No. 10/553,714  
Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2008

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

All of the claims remaining in the application are believed to be allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Dennis M. de Guzman/  
Dennis M. de Guzman  
Registration No. 41,702

DMD:

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1134995\_1.DOC